

Remarks

Claims 1-29 and 32-26 are currently pending and claims 1, 4, 10, 18, 25, and 29 have been amended while claims 30 and 31 have been cancelled. Applicants assert that all claims are in condition for allowance as set forth more fully below.

Interview Summary

The undersigned participated in a telephone interview with the Examiner on January 19, 2005. During the interview, deficiencies in the Lipkin and Manepalli references were discussed in relation to subject matter of the present invention. In particular, it was discussed that the references cited by the Examiner fail to show information being entered via a form of a software program that lacks the ability to save the information in the form of an XML file according to a DTD where an XSLT is applied to the data of the form to produce an XML file for the data entered into the form in accordance with the DTD.

103 Rejections

Claims 1-4, 6 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lipkin (US 2002/0049788) in view of Manepalli (US 2003/0074636). Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lipkin in view of Manepalli and further in view of Murphy (US 2003/0140308). Claims 7-9 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lipkin in view of Manepalli and further in view of Wang (US 2002/003547). Claims 10-11, 13, 15, 17-26, 29-31, 33, and 35-36 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lipkin in view of Chrisfort (US 2002/0078168). Claims 12, 27, and 32 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lipkin in view of Chrisfort and further in view of Chen (US 2003/0018694). Claims 14, 16, and 34 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lipkin in view of Chrisfort and further in view of Ridgley (US Pat 6,583,800). Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lipkin in view of Chrisfort and further in view of Keane (US Pat 6,650,433). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

All pending claims now include recitations to data or information in a form or software program that is incapable of saving data in an XML format where the data or information of the form or software program is saved in an XML format by application of an XSLT to the data of the form or software program. As a representative example, claim 1 recites generating a form-based data entry interface based, at least in part, on the DTD, wherein the form-based data entry interface is incapable of saving data in the form of extensible markup language (XML), inputting data into the form-based data entry interface, applying an extensible stylesheet language (XSL) construct to the data that is input, and through application of the XSL, saving the data in the form of XML consistent with the DTD.

The cited references fail to disclose data within a form or software program that is incapable of saving the data in the format of an XML file where the data is saved as an XML file by application of an XSLT file. Lipkin discloses at the passage cited by the Examiner that the user employs a teeditor or XML tool to create the XML content and file. Thus, the user is generating the XML file format directly from the teeditor or XML tool, as opposed to using a form or software program that is incapable of saving data in the XML file format. The cited passage of Lipkin goes on to say that the XSL is used to then save the XML file in one of various formats, but does not disclose that the XSL file is being used to save data from the form or software where the data has been entered and that is XML incapable into the XML format. I should be noted that while it is stated that the XSL may save in the XML format, it is known that XSL can be used to save an existing XML file as a different XML file so it cannot be assumed that the XSL is saving a non-XML file from a first program into XML format.

Manepalli discloses that GUI forms for data entry are generated by DTD binary objects and that the DTD binary object that generates the GUI form then saves the form to be saved in XML format. Thus, Manepalli also fails to disclose a form or software program that lacks the ability to save files in XML format. Manepalli does not discuss the application of XSL and has no need to do so since the DTD binary object already provides for the XML file. None of the other cited references disclose these recitations either.

Accordingly, these cited references fail to disclose, singly or in combination, the recitations of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is allowable over the cited references for at least these reasons. The additional independent claims 10, 18, and 29 include similar recitations involving a software application incapable of saving data in an XML file format and the application of XSL to the data to create the XML file. These additional independent claims are also allowable over the cited references for at least the same reasons.

It should be further noted that the recitations of first and second database and copy ID as set forth in claim 18 further distinguish claim 18 over the cited references. The copy ID refers to the XML file being accessed, as opposed to any user ID as described in the prior art cited in the rejection of claim 17 which also includes the copy ID recitation. Furthermore, it appears that the first and second database recitations of claim 18 have been overlooked in the previous Office Action, as there is no specific discussion of these recitations and where they are disclosed in the prior art.

Dependent claims 2-9, 11-17, 19-28, and 32-36 depend from allowable base claims and are also allowable for at least the same reasons. Furthermore, one or more of these claims include additional features allowable over the cited art, such as claim 17 which includes the recitations of the copy ID, which is in contrast to a user ID as discussed in the rejection.


Conclusion

Applicants assert that the application including claims 1-29 and 32-36 is now in condition for allowance. Applicants request reconsideration in view of the amendments and remarks above and further request that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

No fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 24, 2005


Jeramie J. Keys
Reg. No. 42,724

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, Ga 30007-1355
(404) 849.2093